

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-13, 15-17, 19-21, and 23-43 are presently active in this case. The present Amendment amends independent Claims 1, 13, 17, and 21, and dependent Claims 16 and 20 without introducing any new matter, and cancels Claims 2, 14, 18, and 22 without prejudice or disclaimer.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Logan et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0093790, hereinafter “Logan”).

In response, independent Claim 1 is amended to recite all the features of Applicants’ dependent Claim 2. In addition, independent Claims 13, 17 and 21 have been amended to recite the features of dependent Claims 14, 18 and 22, respectively. No new matter has been added. Consequently, dependent Claims 2, 14, 18 and 22 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and the claim dependency of dependent Claims 16 and 20 are changed.

In response to the rejection of Claims 1-43 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), in light of the amendments to the independent claims, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this rejection and traverse the rejection, as discussed next.

Briefly summarizing, independent Claim 21 is directed to a bulletin board system that supports information exchange for contents including reference data arranged in time series. The system includes, *inter alia* a related information receiver configured to receive related information from one or more user devices, the related information including an identification of the contents, user remarks to the contents, and a reference time position of the user remarks relating to the contents, a reference information receiver configured to receive reference information from the one or more user devices, the reference information

including a keyword specifying contents to be referred to by the user remarks to the contents, and specifying a time reference position in the contents. In addition, the system includes a unit for specifying an installation region of a terminal apparatus of the one or more user devices to be a provision destination of information; and a unit that changes contents of reference information according to the specified installation region.

Turning now to the applied references, Logan is directed to a system for utilizing metadata created either at a central location 111 for shared use by connected users, or at each individual user's location 135, to enhance user's enjoyment of available broadcast content.

(Logan, Abstract, Fig. 1.) Logan explains that preference data supplied by the user or derived from an analysis of the user's use of the system, or from the viewer's demographic characteristics, may be combined with or used instead of metadata and preference data created at the remote location. (Logan, ¶ [0048]). Moreover, in Logan, metadata can be used to describe segments of content, and can be used to facilitate the task at the user location of generating still further supplemental metadata which describes, rates, annotates or recommends programming content for other users. (Logan, ¶ [0059]). However, Logan fails to teach all the features of Applicants' independent Claim 21. In particular, Logan fails to teach a means for specifying an installation region of a terminal apparatus of the one or more user devices to be a provision destination of information, and means that changes contents of reference information according to the specified installation region, as required by Applicants' independent Claim 21.

In the cited passages, Logan merely explains that metadata can be developed to characterize individual program segments by processing log file data representing choices made by users in selecting and/or abandoning programs, and from program ratings expressly provided by users. (Logan, ¶ [0130]). But these passages of Logan are directed to choices made by users, their history of usage, and their demography, and do not anticipate anything

related to a device that can specify the installation region of the terminal apparatus, that also allows to change contents of reference information according to the specified installation region. Such feature is simply not taught in the cited passages of Logan.

Therefore, the applied reference Logan fails to teach every feature recited in Applicants' Claim 21, so that Claims 21, 23-43 are believed to be patentably distinct over Logan. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse, and request reconsideration of the rejection based on this reference.

Independent Claims 1, 13, and 17 recite features that are analogous to the features recited in independent Claim 21, albeit directed to different statutory classes. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 21, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of Claims 1, 13, and 17 and the rejections of all associated dependent claims, are also believed to be overcome in view of the arguments regarding independent Claim 21.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited passages of Logan fail to teach every feature recited in Applicants' dependent claims. For example, dependent Claim 43 requires that the bulletin board system uses a date and time *when the remark is written* as retrieval conditions. In Logan, content data can be arranged with playlist manager that presents a list of program segments that are available in the user's personal library. (Logan, ¶ [0282], ll. 1-8.) Logan further explains that users may sort the program listing by artist, program name, date and time of capture, source (e.g. radio station call letters), recording quality, user rating, and other parameters. (Logan, ¶ [0282], ll. 9-12.) But nowhere in the cited passages of Logan there is a search feature where a date and time when a *remark* is written into a bulletin board can be searched. Logan merely allows to sort a list based on a "date and time of capture," which refers to the time of capture of the content itself, and not

the associated metadata. Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of Applicants' dependent claims.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal Allowance. A Notice of Allowance for Claims 1, 3-13, 15-17, 19-21, and 23-43 is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action is necessary to place this application in even better form for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Nikolaus P. Schibli, Ph.D.
Registered Patent Agent
Registration No. 56,994

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)